

1
2
3
4 NICOLE MARIE ADAMIK,
5
6 Petitioner,

7 v.
8

9 SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SHERIFF
10 DEPUTY PRICE, et al.,
11 Respondents.

Case No. [24-cv-04174-RMI](#)

ORDER OF TRANSFER

12
13 This is a habeas case filed *pro se* by a prisoner. Petitioner challenges a parole revocation
14 and ongoing criminal prosecution, both in San Joaquin County. San Joaquin County is in the
15 venue of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. Petitioner is also
16 incarcerated in the Eastern District.

17 Venue for a habeas action is proper in either the district of confinement or the district of
18 conviction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). This district is neither. Petitions challenging a conviction are
19 preferably heard in the district of conviction. *See* Habeas L.R. 2254-3(a); *see also Laue v. Nelson*,
20 279 F. Supp. 265, 266 (N.D. Cal. 1968). Because Petitioner's parole was revoked in the Eastern
21 District, and he is being prosecuted and being held in that district, this case is **TRANSFERRED**
22 to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a);
23 Habeas L.R. 2254-3(b).

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: July 18, 2024

26
27
28 
ROBERT M. ILLMAN
United States Magistrate Judge